

## **REMARKS**

### **DRAWING OBJECTIONS**

In the Office Action at page 2, item 3, the Examiner objected to FIG. 11, operation C50, for correcting the spelling of "LAPRACIAN" to --LAPLACIAN--. In order to overcome this objection, one replacement sheet for FIG. 11 is submitted herewith, in which at operation C50, "LAPRACIAN" is corrected to --LAPLACIAN--. Approval and entry of this change to the Drawings is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

### **SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner objected to the specification for a grammatical error. According to the forgoing, the specification, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments, is amended. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS**

#### **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-42 have been pending.

Claims 1-9 and 22-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Williams et al. (U.S. Patent 6,427,031 B1).

Claims 10-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kumagai (U.S. Patent 5,201,013).

Claims 3-4, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-29, 31, 35-36, and 40-41 are amended.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 30, 32-34, 37-39, and 42 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

Thus, claims 3-4, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-29, 31, 35-36, and 40-41 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment. The forgoing rejections are hereby traversed.

Dependent claims 3, 35 and 40 are amended into independent form, and believed to place the application in condition for allowance over the relied upon references, as follows. The Examiner alleges that Williams discloses the claimed present invention's "detecting *the*

*direction in which the profile* of the multilevel input image extends with respect to the noteworthy pixel,” however, Williams does not disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s “detecting *the direction in which the profile* of the multilevel input image extends with respect to the noteworthy pixel,” and “if the result of said discriminating is positive, ~~in step (b),~~ said changing comprises changing the error diffusion technique from one to another, and values according to the occurred error are added to the values of the unscanned pixels along the detected direction of the profile as an exceptional process” (e.g., amended independent claim 3, emphasis added). The Examiner in page 5 of the Office Action, relies on Williams, column 11, lines 17-25 for allegedly disclosing the claimed present invention’s “*values according to the occurred error* are added to the values of the *unscanned pixels along the detected direction of the profile as an exceptional process*,” however, this Williams disclosure describes the steps for determining the printing or rendering of a subpixel as part of extending the conventional error diffusion process to a high addressability environment, with reference to FIG. 39 (column 10, line 49 to column 11, line 25). In particular, Williams in column 11, lines 12-14 discloses, “initially, the modified pixel values  $P0(i)=V(i-1)+e(i-1)=P1(i-1)$  and  $P1(i)=V(i)+e(i)$  are computed at two locations corresponding to the input resolution,” which does not disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s “*values according to the occurred error* are added to the values of the *unscanned pixels along the detected direction of the profile as an exceptional process*” (e.g., amended independent claim 3, emphasis added).

Support for independent claims 3, 35 and 40, can be found, for example, in page 25, line 3 through page 32, line 26; and FIGS. 6 and 7 (and FIG. 9, operation A100, FIG. 10, operation B110), of the present Application.

In view of the claim amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.


**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 3, 2004

By:   
Mehdi Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501